



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/752,607	01/06/2004	Guangming Carl Shi	030517	6044
23596 7590 11/26/2010 QUALCOMM INCORPORATED 5775 MOREHOUSE DR. SAN DIEGO, CA 92121				
EXAMINER				
DANIEL JR, WILLIE J				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2617				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/26/2010		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

us-docketing@qualcomm.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/752,607

**Applicant(s)**

SHI, GUANGMING CARL

**Examiner**

WILLIE J. DANIEL JR

**Art Unit**

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 May 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 53-80 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 53-80 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
\_\_\_\_\_ Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to applicant's amendment filed on 14 May 2010. **Claims 53-80** are now pending in the present application and **claims 1-52** are canceled. This office action is made **Final**.

### *Claim Objections*

2. **Claims 57, 62, 67, 75, and 80** are objected to because of the following informalities:
  - a. Claim 57 recites the limitation "...the **tow** or..." in line(s) 9 of the claim. The Examiner interprets as --the **two** or-- (see claim 57, line(s) 7) and suggests replacing said limitation to have proper **antecedent** and help clarify the claim language. Also, see **claim 62, 67, 75, and 80**.
  - b. Claim 67 recites the language "...**media** of claim **55**..." on line 1 of the claim. The Examiner interprets as "...media of claim **63**..." and requests the applicant to provide proper dependency for *dependent* claim 67. For example, *dependent* claim 55 is drawn to a **method**.
  - c. Claim 75 recites the language "...**device** of claim **56**..." on line 1 of the claim. The Examiner interprets as "...device of claim **71**..." and requests the applicant to provide proper dependency for *dependent* claim 75. For example, *dependent* claim 56 is drawn to a **method**.Appropriate correction is required.
3. A series of singular dependent claims is permissible in which a dependent claim refers to a preceding claim which, in turn, refers to another preceding claim.

A claim which depends from a dependent claim should not be separated by any claim which does not also depend from said dependent claim. It should be kept in mind that a dependent claim may refer to any preceding independent claim. In general, applicant's sequence will not be changed. See MPEP § 608.01(n).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 53-56, 61, 63-66, 71-74, and 79** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kolev et al.** (hereinafter **Kolev**) (**US 6,125,283**) in view of **Kaplan** (**US 5,884,193**).

Regarding **claim 53**, Kolev discloses a method of communications, comprising:

receiving, at a communications device, an origination request for a call (see col. 6, lines 28-34; col. 8, lines 8-11; col. 9, lines 20-24; Figs. 5-6B), including parameters that include a dialing string (see col. 11, lines 1-9; col. 3, lines 36-37; col. 6, lines 35-36; Figs. 4-5 and 6B “ref. 130, 128”), where the user terminal (60) has an user interface (70) for input dialing numbers (e.g., string);

identifying a plurality of communications networks (20, 40) supported by the communications device (see col. 6, lines 18-28, 36-41, 44-49; col. 6, line 61 - col. 7, line 8; Fig. 5), where the dual-mode mobile terminal is able to communicate with a satellite network

(40) and/or a terrestrial network (20 - GSM or AMPS) according to service parameters (e.g., compatibility, level of service, and/or type of communications) (see col. 5, line 52 - col. 6, line 13; col. 9, lines 2-5,20-23; Figs. 5-6B);

determining whether the dialing string indicates an emergency number and generating a first marking indicating that the call is allowed on each of the plurality of communications networks if the dialing string indicates an emergency number (see col. 8, lines 5-13; col. 9, lines 53-54,61-66);

accessing, for each of the plurality of communications networks, user-defined permission information and comparing the dialing string to the user-defined permission information to determine if the call is allowed or is not allowed on each of the identified communications networks (20, 40) (see col. 6, lines 32-49; col. 6, line 64 - col. 7, line 8; Figs. 4), where the user terminal (60) accesses information stored in memory (68) and SIM (72), and where the network processes the call request of the user terminal (see col. 11, lines 1-9; col. 3, lines 36-37; col. 6, lines 35-36,50-54; col. 9, lines 20-24; Figs. 6A-B) and the user (or subscriber) has subscribed to services of the user's preference to allow for access to different networks (see col. 3, lines 58-64; col. 6, lines 32-40; col. 7, lines 3-8; col. 8, lines 6-10; col. 11, lines 1-9);

originating the call on a respective one of the plurality of communications networks if the call was determined to be allowed on the respective one of the plurality of communications networks (20, 40) (see col. 11, lines 5-8; col. 9, lines 20-24; Figs. 6A-B), where the network processes the call request of the user terminal,

wherein the user-defined permission information comprises at least one of phone number allowed or phone number not allowed (see col. 3, lines 58-64; col. 6, lines 32-40; col. 7, lines

3-8; col. 8, lines 6-10; col. 11, lines 1-9), where the user (or subscriber) has subscribed to services of the user's preference to allow for access to different networks and to permit calls such as an emergency (see col. 11, lines 1-9). Kolev does not specifically disclose having the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network and a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network, wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card within the communication device. However, the examiner maintains that the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network and a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network, wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card within the communication device was well known in the art, as taught by Kaplan.

In the same field of endeavor, Kaplan discloses the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network (see col. 5, lines 2-20) and

a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network (see col. 5, lines 21-33),

wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card (e.g., 104, 130) within the communication device (e.g., 100) (see col. 5, lines 5-8, 21-23; Fig. 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kolev and Kaplan to have the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network and a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network, wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card within the communication device, in order to provide a system and method for call restrictions that are implemented by the wireless communication device, as taught by Kaplan (see col. 1, lines 51-53).

Regarding **claim 61**, Kolev discloses a method of communications, comprising:  
receiving, at a communications device, an origination request for a call (see col. 6, lines 28-34; col. 8, lines 8-11; col. 9, lines 20-24; Figs. 5-6B), including parameters that include a dialing string (see col. 11, lines 1-9; col. 3, lines 36-37; col. 6, lines 35-36; Figs. 4-5 and 6B “ref. 130, 128”), where the user terminal (60) has an user interface (70) for input dialing numbers (e.g., string);

identifying a plurality of communications networks (20, 40) supported by the communications device (see col. 6, lines 18-28, 36-41, 44-49; col. 6, line 61 - col. 7, line 8; Fig. 5), where the dual-mode mobile terminal is able to communicate with a satellite network (40) and/or a terrestrial network (20 - GSM or AMPS) according to service parameters (e.g., compatibility, level of service, and/or type of communications) (see col. 5, line 52 - col. 6, line 13; col. 9, lines 2-5, 20-23; Figs. 5-6B);

determining whether the dialing string indicates an emergency number and generating a

first marking indicating that the call is allowed on each of the plurality of communications networks if the dialing string indicates an emergency number (see col. 8, lines 5-13; col. 9, lines 53-54,61-66);

accessing, for each of the plurality of communications networks, user-defined permission information and comparing the dialing string to the user-defined permission information to determine if the call is allowed or is not allowed on each of the identified communications networks (20, 40) (see col. 6, lines 32-49; col. 6, line 64 - col. 7, line 8; Figs. 4), where the user terminal (60) accesses information stored in memory (68) and SIM (72) and, where the network processes the call request of the user terminal (see col. 11, lines 1-9; col. 3, lines 36-37; col. 6, lines 35-36,50-54; col. 9, lines 20-24; Figs. 6A-B), and where the network access is not allowed or blocked (see col. 7, lines 22-29; col. 8, lines 49-59; col. 11, lines 8-9; Figs. 6A, 6B “ref. 134, 126”) and the user (or subscriber) has subscribed to services of the user’s preference to allow for access to different networks (see col. 3, lines 58-64; col. 6, lines 32-40; col. 7, lines 3-8; col. 8, lines 6-10; col. 11, lines 1-9);

preventing the call from being originated on a respective one of the plurality of communications networks if the call was determined to be not allowed on the respective one of the plurality of communications networks (see col. 7, lines 22-29; col. 8, lines 49-59; col. 11, lines 8-9; Figs. 6A, 6B “ref. 134, 126”), where the network access is not allowed or blocked; and

wherein the user-defined permission information comprises at least one of phone number allowed or phone number not allowed (see col. 3, lines 58-64; col. 6, lines 32-40; col. 7, lines 3-8; col. 8, lines 6-10; col. 11, lines 1-9), where the user (or subscriber) has subscribed to



services of the user's preference to allow for access to different networks and to permit calls such as an emergency (see col. 11, lines 1-9). Kolev does not specifically disclose having the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network and a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network, wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card within the communication device. However, the examiner maintains that the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network and a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network, wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card within the communication device was well known in the art, as taught by Kaplan.

In the same field of endeavor, Kaplan discloses the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network (see col. 5, lines 2-20) and

a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network (see col. 5, lines 21-33),

wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card (e.g., 104, 130) within the communication device (e.g., 100) (see col. 5, lines 5-8, 21-23; Fig. 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kolev and Kaplan to have the feature(s)

comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network and a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network, wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card within the communication device, in order to provide a system and method for call restrictions that are implemented by the wireless communication device, as taught by Kaplan (see col. 1, lines 51-53).

Regarding **claim 63**, Kolev discloses a computer readable media embodying a program of instructions executable by a processor to perform a method of communications (see Figs. 4-6B), the method comprising:

receiving, at a communications device, an origination request for a call (see col. 6, lines 28-34; col. 8, lines 8-11; col. 9, lines 20-24; Figs. 5-6B), including parameters that include a dialing string (see col. 11, lines 1-9; col. 3, lines 36-37; col. 6, lines 35-36; Figs. 4-5 and 6B “ref. 130, 128”), where the user terminal (60) has an user interface (70) for input dialing numbers (e.g., string);

identifying a plurality of communications networks (20, 40) supported by the communications device (see col. 6, lines 18-28, 36-41, 44-49; col. 6, line 61 - col. 7, line 8; Fig. 5), where the dual-mode mobile terminal is able to communicate with a satellite network (40) and/or a terrestrial network (20 - GSM or AMPS) according to service parameters (e.g., compatibility, level of service, and/or type of communications) (see col. 5, line 52 - col. 6, line 13; col. 9, lines 2-5, 20-23; Figs. 5-6B);

determining whether the dialing string indicates an emergency number and generating a

first marking indicating that the call is allowed on each of the plurality of communications networks if the dialing string indicates an emergency number (see col. 8, lines 5-13; col. 9, lines 53-54,61-66);

accessing, for each of the plurality of communications networks, user-defined permission information and comparing the dialing string to the user-defined permission information to determine if the call is allowed or is not allowed on each of the identified communications networks (20, 40) (see col. 6, lines 32-49; col. 6, line 64 - col. 7, line 8; Figs. 4), where the user terminal (60) accesses information stored in memory (68) and SIM (72) and, where the network processes the call request of the user terminal (see col. 11, lines 1-9; col. 3, lines 36-37; col. 6, lines 35-36,50-54; col. 9, lines 20-24; Figs. 6A-B) and the user (or subscriber) has subscribed to services of the user's preference to allow for access to different networks (see col. 3, lines 58-64; col. 6, lines 32-40; col. 7, lines 3-8; col. 8, lines 6-10; col. 11, lines 1-9), and

originating the call over a respective one of the plurality of communications networks (20, 40) if the call is determined to be allowed on the respective one of the plurality of communications networks (20, 40) (see col. 11, lines 5-8; col. 9, lines 20-24; Figs. 6A-B), where the network processes the call request of the user terminal, and

preventing the call from being originating if the call is determined not to be allowed on the respective one of the plurality of communications networks (20, 40) (see col. 7, lines 22-29; col. 8, lines 49-59; col. 11, lines 8-9; Figs. 6A, 6B "ref. 134, 126"), where the network (20, 40) access is not allowed or blocked,

wherein the user-defined permission information comprises at least one of phone number

allowed or phone number not allowed (see col. 3, lines 58-64; col. 6, lines 32-40; col. 7, lines 3-8; col. 8, lines 6-10; col. 11, lines 1-9), where the user (or subscriber) has subscribed to services of the user's preference to allow for access to different networks and to permit calls such as an emergency (see col. 11, lines 1-9). Kolev does not specifically disclose having the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network and a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network, wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card within the communication device. However, the examiner maintains that the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network and a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network, wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card within the communication device was well known in the art, as taught by Kaplan.

In the same field of endeavor, Kaplan discloses the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network (see col. 5, lines 2-20) and

a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network (see col. 5, lines 21-33),

wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card (e.g., 104, 130) within the communication device (e.g., 100) (see col. 5, lines 5-8, 21-23; Fig. 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kolev and Kaplan to have the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network and a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network, wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card within the communication device, in order to provide a system and method for call restrictions that are implemented by the wireless communication device, as taught by Kaplan (see col. 1, lines 51-53).

Regarding **claim 71**, Kolev discloses a user terminal (60) which reads on claimed “communications device” (see col. 6, 18-22; Figs. 4-6B), comprising:

an user interface (70) which reads on the claimed “input device” configured to receive an origination request for a call (see col. 6, lines 28-36; col. 8, lines 8-11; col. 9, lines 20-24; Figs. 4-6B), including parameters that include a dialing string (see col. 11, lines 1-9; col. 3, lines 36-37; col. 6, lines 35-36; Figs. 4-5 and 6B “ref. 130, 128”), where the user terminal (60) has an user interface (70) for input dialing numbers (e.g., string);

an user terminal memory (68) which reads on the claimed “memory device” for storing information user-defined permission information for each of a plurality of communications networks supported by the communication device (see col. 6, lines 32-34; Fig. 4), where the user (or subscriber) has subscribed to services of the user’s preference to allow for access to different networks (see col. 3, lines 58-64; col. 6, lines 32-40; col. 7, lines 3-8; col. 8, lines 6-10; col. 11, lines 1-9),

wherein the respective user-defined information is different for at least two of the plurality of communications networks (see col. 6, lines 32-49; col. 6, line 64 - col. 7, line 8; Figs. 4), where the user terminal (60) accesses information stored in memory (68) and SIM (72) and, where the network processes the call request of the user terminal (see col. 11, lines 1-9; col. 3, lines 36-37; col. 6, lines 35-36,50-54; col. 9, lines 20-24; Figs. 6A-B) and the user (or subscriber) has subscribed to services of the user's preference to allow for access to different networks (see col. 3, lines 58-64; col. 6, lines 32-40; col. 7, lines 3-8; col. 8, lines 6-10; col. 11, lines 1-9);

a processor (66) (see Fig. 4) configured to:

identifying a plurality of communications networks (20, 40) supported by the communications device (see col. 6, lines 18-28, 36-41,44-49; col. 6, line 61 - col. 7, line 8; Fig. 5), where the dual-mode mobile terminal is able to communicate with a satellite network (40) and/or a terrestrial network (20 - GSM or AMPS) according to service parameters (e.g., compatibility, level of service, and/or type of communications) (see col. 5, line 52 - col. 6, line 13; col. 9, lines 2-5,20-23; Figs. 5-6B);

determine whether the dialing string indicates an emergency number and generate a first marking indicating that the call is allowed on each of the plurality of communications networks if the dialing string indicates an emergency number (see col. 8, lines 5-13; col. 9, lines 53-54,61-66);

access, for each of the plurality of communications networks, the user-defined permission information and comparing the dialing string to the user-defined permission information to determine if the call is allowed or is not allowed on each of the identified communications

networks (20, 40) (see col. 6, lines 32-49; col. 6, line 64 - col. 7, line 8; Figs. 4), where the user terminal (60) accesses information stored in memory (68) and SIM (72) and, where the network processes the call request of the user terminal (see col. 11, lines 1-9; col. 3, lines 36-37; col. 6, lines 35-36, 50-54; col. 9, lines 20-24; Figs. 6A-B) and the user (or subscriber) has subscribed to services of the user's preference to allow for access to different networks (see col. 3, lines 58-64; col. 6, lines 32-40; col. 7, lines 3-8; col. 8, lines 6-10; col. 11, lines 1-9);

originating the call over a respective one of the plurality of communications networks (20, 40) if the processor determines that the call is allowed on the respective one of the plurality of communications networks (20, 40) (see col. 11, lines 5-8; col. 9, lines 20-24; Figs. 6A-B), where the network processes the call request of the user terminal;

prevent the call from being originating over the respective one of the plurality of communications network (20, 40) if the processor determines that the call is not allowed on the respective one of the plurality of communications networks (20, 40) (see col. 7, lines 22-29; col. 8, lines 49-59; col. 11, lines 8-9; Figs. 6A, 6B "ref. 134, 126"), where the network access is not allowed or blocked; and

wherein the user-defined permission information comprises at least one of an allowed phone number or blocked phone number (see col. 3, lines 58-64; col. 6, lines 32-40; col. 7, lines 3-8; col. 8, lines 6-10; col. 11, lines 1-9), where the user (or subscriber) has subscribed to services of the user's preference to allow for access to different networks and to permit calls such as an emergency (see col. 11, lines 1-9). Kolev does not specifically disclose having the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network and a block list indicating

one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network, wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card within the communication device. However, the examiner maintains that the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network and a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network, wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card within the communication device was well known in the art, as taught by Kaplan.

In the same field of endeavor, Kaplan discloses the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network (see col. 5, lines 2-20) and

a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network (see col. 5, lines 21-33),

wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card (e.g., 104, 130) within the communication device (e.g., 100) (see col. 5, lines 5-8, 21-23; Fig. 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kolev and Kaplan to have the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network and a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network, wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card within the



communication device, in order to provide a system and method for call restrictions that are implemented by the wireless communication device, as taught by Kaplan (see col. 1, lines 51-53).

Regarding **claim 79**, Kolev discloses a user terminal (60) which reads on claimed “communications device” (see col. 6, 18-22; Figs. 4-6B), comprising:

means (66) for receiving an origination request for a call, including parameters that include a dialing string (see col. 11, lines 1-9; col. 3, lines 36-37; col. 6, lines 35-36; Figs. 4-5 and 6B “ref. 130, 128”), where the user terminal (60) has an user interface (70) for input dialing numbers (e.g., string);

means (66) for identifying a plurality of communications networks (20, 40) supported by the communications device (see col. 6, lines 18-28, 36-41,44-49; col. 6, line 61 - col. 7, line 8; Fig. 5), where the dual-mode mobile terminal is able to communicate with a satellite network (40) and/or a terrestrial network (20 - GSM or AMPS) according to service parameters (e.g., compatibility, level of service, and/or type of communications) (see col. 5, line 52 - col. 6, line 13; col. 9, lines 2-5,20-23; Figs. 5-6B);

means for determining whether the dialing string indicates an emergency number and generating a first marking indicating that the call is allowed on each of the plurality of communications networks if the dialing string indicates an emergency number (see col. 8, lines 5-13; col. 9, lines 53-54,61-66);

means (66) for accessing, for each of the plurality of communications networks, the user-defined permission information and comparing the dialing string to the user-defined permission information to determine if the call is allowed or is not allowed on each of the

identified communications networks (20, 40) (see col. 6, lines 32-49; col. 6, line 64 - col. 7, line 8; Figs. 4), where the user terminal (60) accesses information stored in memory (68) and SIM (72) and, where the network processes the call request of the user terminal (see col. 11, lines 1-9; col. 3, lines 36-37; col. 6, lines 35-36, 50-54; col. 9, lines 20-24; Figs. 6A-B) and the user (or subscriber) has subscribed to services of the user's preference to allow for access to different networks (see col. 3, lines 58-64; col. 6, lines 32-40; col. 7, lines 3-8; col. 8, lines 6-10; col. 11, lines 1-9);

means (66) for originating the call over a respective one of the plurality of communications networks (20, 40) if the call is determined to be allowed on the respective one of the plurality of communications networks (20, 40) (see col. 11, lines 5-8; col. 9, lines 20-24; Figs. 6A-B), where the network processes the call request of the user terminal;

means (66) for preventing the call over the respective one of the plurality of communications networks (20, 40) if the call is determined not to be allowed on the respective one of the plurality of communications networks (20, 40) (see col. 7, lines 22-29; col. 8, lines 49-59; col. 11, lines 8-9; Figs. 6A, 6B "ref. 134, 126"), where the network access is not allowed or blocked; and

wherein the user-defined permission information comprises at least one of phone number allowed or phone number not allowed (see col. 3, lines 58-64; col. 6, lines 32-40; col. 7, lines 3-8; col. 8, lines 6-10; col. 11, lines 1-9), where the user (or subscriber) has subscribed to services of the user's preference to allow for access to different networks and to permit calls such as an emergency (see col. 11, lines 1-9). Kolev does not specifically disclose having the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers

allowed on a particular communications network and a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network, wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card within the communication device. However, the examiner maintains that the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network and a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network, wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card within the communication device was well known in the art, as taught by Kaplan.

In the same field of endeavor, Kaplan discloses the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network (see col. 5, lines 2-20) and

a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network (see col. 5, lines 21-33),

wherein the fixed dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card (e.g., 104, 130) within the communication device (e.g., 100) (see col. 5, lines 5-8, 21-23; Fig. 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kolev and Kaplan to have the feature(s) comprises at least one of a fixed dialing list indicating one or more phone numbers allowed on a particular communications network and a block list indicating one or more phone numbers that are not allowed on a particular communications network, wherein the fixed

dialing list and the block list are programmed by a user into a communication card within the communication device, in order to provide a system and method for call restrictions that are implemented by the wireless communication device, as taught by Kaplan (see col. 1, lines 51-53).

Regarding **claim 54, 64, and 72**, the combination of Kolev and Kaplan discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claims 53, 63, & 71), in addition Kolev further discloses the method of claims 53, computer readable media of claim 63, and communications device of claims 71, wherein determining the call is allowed further comprises comparing the dialing string to user-defined permission information, and wherein at least a portion of the user-defined permission information is accessed from at least one of a SIM card, an R-UIM card, and a USIM card (see col. 6, lines 1-9).

Regarding **claims 55, 65, and 73**, the combination of Kolev and Kaplan discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claims 53, 63, & 71), in addition Kolev further discloses the method of claim 53, computer readable media of claim 63, and communications device of claim 71 wherein the call origination request comprises an indication that the call is an emergency call (see col. 8, lines 5-13).

Regarding **claims 56 and 66**, the combination of Kolev and Kaplan discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claims 55 & 65), in addition Kolev further discloses the method of claim 55 and computer readable media of claim 65 further comprising indicating that the call is allowed on each one of the plurality of communications networks (20, 40) (see col. 8, lines 5-20).

Regarding **claim 74**, the combination of Kolev and Kaplan discloses every limitation

claimed, as applied above (see claim 73), in addition Kolev further discloses the communications device of claim 73 wherein the processor is further configured to indicate that the call is allowed or is not allowed on each one of the plurality of communications networks (20, 40) (see col. 8, lines 5-20), where the network (20, 40) access is not allowed or blocked (see col. 7, lines 22-29; col. 8, lines 49-59; col. 11, lines 8-9; Figs. 6A, 6B “ref. 134, 126”).

**Claims 57-59, 62, 67-69, 75-77, and 80** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kolev et al.** (hereinafter **Kolev**) (**US 6,125,283**) in view of **Kaplan** (**US 5,884,193**) as applied to claims 53, 61, 63, 71, & 79 above, and further in view of **Jonsson** (**US 5,915,224**).

Regarding **claims 57, 62, 67, 75, and 80**, Kolev discloses the method of claim 53, further comprising:

upon determining that the call is not allowed on one or more of the plurality of communications networks, generating a second marking to indicate that the call is not allowed (see col. 6, line 64 - col. 7, line 8; Figs. 6A-B), where the network (20, 40) access is not allowed or blocked (see col. 7, lines 22-29; col. 8, lines 49-59; col. 11, lines 8-9; Figs. 6A, 6B “ref. 134, 126”);

for each communications network where the call has been determined to be allowed (see col. 11, lines 5-8; col. 9, lines 20-24; Figs. 6A-B), where the network processes the call request of the user terminal,

generating two or more output data fields, a first of the two or more output data fields comprising the input dialing string, and a second of the two or more output data fields comprising one or more bits for indicating the first, second, and third markings(see col. 6, line 64 - col. 7, line 8; col. 11, lines 5-8; col. 9, lines 20-24; Figs. 6A-B); and

wherein originating the call on a respective one or the plurality of communications networks comprises determining a selected network to originate the call on based on the two or more output data fields (see col. 11, lines 5-8; col. 9, lines 20-24; Figs. 6A-B), where the network processes the call request of the user terminal. Kolev does not specifically disclose having the feature(s) determining whether the dialing string is to be altered, and upon determining that the dialing string is to be altered, generating a third marking indicating that the dialing string is to be altered; the third marking has been generated, an altered dialing string. However, the examiner maintains that the feature(s) determining whether the dialing string is to be altered, and upon determining that the dialing string is to be altered, generating a third marking indicating that the dialing string is to be altered; the third marking has been generated, an altered dialing string was well known in the art, as taught by Jonsson.

In the same field of endeavor, Jonsson discloses the feature(s) determining whether the dialing string (e.g., sequence) is to be altered, and upon determining that the dialing string is to be altered, generating a third marking indicating that the dialing string is to be altered; the third marking has been generated, an altered dialing string (see col. 14, lines 28-39), where the area code is added to a keying sequence.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kolev and Jonsson to have the feature(s)

determining whether the dialing string (e.g., sequence) is to be altered, and upon determining that the dialing string is to be altered, generating a third marking indicating that the dialing string is to be altered; the third marking has been generated, an altered dialing string, in order to decide which networks are accessible at the time a call is made in a traffic originating purpose, as taught by Jonsson (see col. 5, lines 6-12).

Regarding **claims 58, 68, and 76**, Kolev discloses a method, computer readable media, and communications device as applied above in claims 57, 67, and 75, in addition Kolev further discloses a processor (66) (see Fig. 4). Kolev does not specifically disclose having the feature further comprising altering the dialing string before originating the call. However, the examiner maintains that the feature further comprising altering the dialing string before originating the call was well known in the art, as taught by Jonsson.

In the same field of endeavor, Jonsson discloses the feature further comprising altering the sequence which reads on the claimed “dialing string” before originating the call (see col. 14, lines 28-39), where the area code is added to a keying sequence.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kolev and Jonsson to have the feature further comprising altering the dialing string before originating the call, in order to decide which networks are accessible at the time a call is made in a traffic originating purpose, as taught by Jonsson (see col. 5, lines 6-12).

Regarding **claims 59, 69, and 77**, Kolev discloses every limitation claimed as applied above in claims 58, 68, and 76, in addition Kolev further discloses a processor (66) (see Fig. 4). Kolev does not specifically disclose having the feature wherein the altering of the dialing

string comprises replacing the dialing string with a new dialing string. However, the examiner maintains that the feature wherein the altering of the dialing string comprises replacing the dialing string with a new dialing string was well known in the art, as taught by Jonsson.

Jonsson further discloses the feature wherein the altering of the dialing string comprises replacing the dialing string with a new dialing string (see col. 14, lines 15-25; Figs. 14-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kolev, Kaplan, and Jonsson to have the feature wherein the altering of the dialing string comprises replacing the dialing string with a new dialing string, in order to decide which networks are accessible at the time a call is made in a traffic originating purpose, as taught by Jonsson (see col. 5, lines 6-12).

**Claims 60, 70, and 78** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kolev et al.** (hereinafter Kolev) (**US 6,125,283**) in view of **Kaplan** (**US 5,884,193**) and **Jonsson** (**US 5,915,224**) as applied to claims 6, 17, and 26, above, and further in view of **Sakai et al.** (hereinafter Sakai) (**US 7,010,296 B2**).

Regarding **claims 60, 70, and 78**, the combination of Kolev and Jonsson discloses every limitation claimed as applied above in claims 58, 68, and 76, in addition Kolev further discloses a processor (66) (see Fig. 4). The combination of Kolev and Jonsson does not specifically disclose having the feature wherein the altering of the dialing string comprises replacing the dialing string with a service request code. However, the examiner maintains



that the feature wherein the altering of the dialing string comprises replacing the dialing string with a service request code was well known in the art, as taught by Sakai.

In the same field of endeavor, Sakai discloses the feature wherein the altering of the dialing string comprises replacing the dialing string with a service request code (see col. 9, lines 5-21; col. 10, lines 38-48; Figs. 4-5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kolev, Kaplan, Jonsson, and Sakai to have the feature wherein the altering of the dialing string comprises replacing the dialing string with a service request code, in order to achieve prompt processing when communication-service terminal request service, as taught by Sakai (see col. 3, lines 15-19).

#### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 53-80 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection necessitated by the new claims.

In response to applicant's arguments, the Examiner respectfully disagrees as the applied reference(s) provide more than adequate support and to further clarify (see the above claims for relevant citations and comments in this section).

6. The language of the restricted claims filed 20 November 2009 was included in the response filed on 14 May 2010.
7. The Examiner requests applicant to provide support (e.g., page(s), line(s), and drawing(s) as well as comments) for the amended claim language and any further amended claim language.

### ***Conclusion***

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
  - a. Zirul et al. (US 2002/0098874 A1) discloses a cellular telephone with programmable authorized telephone number.
9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to WILLIE J. DANIEL JR whose telephone number is (571)272-7907. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Appiah can be reached on (571) 272-7904. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/WJD,Jr/

WJD,Jr  
19 November 2010

/Charles N. Appiah/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617